posting a case to a date when it had a good chance of being taken up. This saved expense and worry to parties. The greatest complaint was long adjournments. No adjournment should go beyond 6 months. What was wanted was more courts to clear arrears. When work became current, there would be no trouble. In simple cases where there was not much evidence to be recorded, judges may be instructed to give short dates.

Reply of Government.--There is nothing wrong in waiting lists. The complaint is that some cases cannot find a date earlier than a year. The reason is that some courts have more work than is possible to manage with short adjournments.

SUBJECT No. 60.

Empowering civil courts to pass injunction orders when the subject matter of the suit is not less than Rs. 50

Mr. Venkataramaiah, Chiknayakanhalli Taluk.

Summary of discussion.—Injunction orders are given only when a suit is above Rs. 100 in value. Former limit was only Rs. 50. By injunction is meant attachment before judgment of immoveables.

The Chief Judge explained that it was enhancement of small cause jurisdiction to Rs. 100 in some courts that had resulted in this and that even then movables could be attached.

Reply of Government.—No change is called for.

SUBJECT No. 61.

Interest at 9% both on the decree amount and court costs.

Messrs. G. S. Murigappa and Honne Gowda, Gubbi Taluk.

Summary of Dicussion.—Rate of interest must be enhanced to 9 per cent.

The Chief Judge said that the point of view of debtors will also have to be taken into consideration. This is the practice in British India.

Reply of Government.—No change is necessary.

SUBJECT No. 62.

Execution of Mysore civil court decrees in the Bombay Presidency and removal of limitation bar.

Messrs. N. Gurulingappa, K. Basalingappa, Honnali Taluk and Y. K. Virupaiya, Nyamti Municipality

Summary of Discussion.—Bombay decrees are executed here while the reverse is not the case. Suits will have to be filed there. Courts here do not take into account whether it is *exparte* decree or not, but execute it.

The Chief Judge said that, if so, it was a mistake and an appeal could be filed.

It was urged further that the judges should look into this before issuing processes or issue a notice in the first instance in such cases.

Reply of Government.—Will be considered.

SUBJECT No. 63.

Empowering Bench Magistrates to dispose of civil suits of the value of Rs. 50 and below.

Mr. H. S. Venkatappa Gowda, Tirthahalli Taluk.

Summary of Discussion.—To go a long distance to file suits is hard, hence the proposition. There will be less cost.

Many members strongly opposed the proposal.

Reply of Government.—The remedy lies in applying for village courts. It is inadmissible to combine civil and criminal functions.

SUBJECT No. 64.

Appointment of a clerk and a peon to each Bench Court.

Summary of Discussion.—It was urged that the clerk was not a subordinate of the Bench Magistrates. There was no control or discipline and that diaries had been torn or destroyed. The clerk makes the magistrates wait. Without establishment, there is no use of establishing

Messrs. Eusuff Khan, Sub-Taluk, Narashmana Rao Nadig Bhaskara Sorab Taluk.

courts at all. Bench Magistrates have no control over the clerks who are subordinates to the Amildar. The dual control is not conducive to efficient work.

It was also represented that the Bench Magistrates had no prestige and were not given a belted peon even. One belted peon for each Court, and one clerk—this is all that is wanted. It is for the Court and not for the Magistrates. The point has been pressed for years. Magistrates work on all days now and have to act as criers also.

The First Member of Council explained that most Courts have not enough work for a separate clerk.

Reply of Government.—Noted for consideration. All possible facilities will be given.

SUBJECT No. 65.

(*a*) Patels to be invested with criminal powers.

(*b*) Village Munsiffs to be invested with criminal powers.

Messrs. B. Shivaji Wadiyar and Nadig Bhaskara Rao, Sorab Taluk.

Summary of Discussion.—In Bombay, patel is given criminal powers. The same concession may be given here to literate and deserving patels. Even hakdar patels enjoy these privileges there.

Per Contra it was urged that this would be dangerous and people would be put to a lot of hardship. Patel is a Police Officer and cannot be made a magistrate.

Reply of Government.—There is no necessity for the measure. People have not pressed for it.

SUBJECT No. 66.

Granting copies of certain documents to the accused before trial.

Mr. B. Narasinga Rao, Seringapatam Taluk.

Summary of Discussion.—First information report is the basis of a case. If exhibited, copy is given; otherwise not. There is generally a different turn given to the case. People ought to know the defects in Police investigation. The enclosure *i.e.*, the patels report, which is a complaint, is treated likewise. We want copies during trial *i.e.*, after charge sheet is filed. If copies cannot be given before trial, let them be given after commencement of trial. Let only the patel's report be given and not that of Station House Officer. Generally, the lawyers and parties get this information privately and by giving it, corruption will be stopped.

Reply of Government.—The question will be examined. The Chief Court and the Inspector-General of Police will be consulted.

SUBJECT No. 67.

Succession of the widow to the properties of a member of an undivided family when he dies without a male child.

Mr. Venkataramaiya, Chiknayakanhalli Taluk.

Summary of Discussion.—In a divided family, the widow and daughter inherits the property of the deceased if he dies without a male issue. This is not the case if the family is a joint one. This must be changed.

Reply of Government.—If a separate Bill is brought in the Legislative Council, it will be considered.